Non-Markovianity Quantifier of an Arbitrary Quantum Process

Tiago Debarba[1] and Felipe F. Fanchini[2]

[1] *Universidade Tecnológica Federal do Paraná (UTFPR), Campus Cornélio Procópio, Avenida Alberto Carazzai 1640, Cornélio Procópio, Paraná 86300-000, Brazil*[*]

[2] *Faculdade de Ciências, UNESP - Universidade Estadual Paulista, Bauru, São Paulo 17033-360, Brazil*[†]

(Dated: December 15, 2016)

Calculating the degree of non-Markovianity of a dissipative process is a difficult task, even for the dynamics of a single qubit, given the complex maximization problem. In this work, focusing on the entanglement-based quantifier of non-Markovianity, we present an analytical solution for such an optimization problem. We then propose a computable non-Markovianity measure based on generalized robustness of entanglement, an entanglement measure that can be readily calculated by a semidefinite programming method. We show that the non-Markovianity, in a given interval of time, can be witnessed by calculating the expectation value of an observable, making it attractive for experimental investigations.

PACS numbers: 03.65.Yz, 42.50.Lc, 03.65.Ud

arXiv:1612.04625v1 [quant-ph] 14 Dec 2016

Recently, non-Markovian processes have been receiving special attention in the literature [1]. In fact, the understanding of non-Markovian process is important for practical applications such as communication protocols, quantum algorithms, and quantum cryptography [2]. Much effort has been devoted to the characterization and quantification of non-Markovianity in dissipative process. Several measures have been presented, and among the most evident, we can mention the measure based on the trace distance defined by Breuer, Laine, and Pillo [3], the measure based on entanglement dynamics defined by Rivas, Huelga, and Plenio [4], and the measure based on the dynamics of mutual information defined by Luo, Fu, and Song [5].

It is known that, in general, such measures do not agree on the description of dissipative dynamics, differing even when defining a process such as Markovian [6–9]. Moreover, besides these differences, they have a particular and unpleasant feature in common: all are computationally difficult to evaluate because the number of variables involved is hugely increased with the system size. This makes the study of non-Markovian processes an extremely difficult task, and it is exactly in this direction that we develop our work by presenting an efficient new strategy.

Focusing on the non-Markovianity measure based on entanglement dynamics, we first solve the maximization problem analytically. We show that, for an arbitrary quantum process and independent of the system size, the state that maximizes the quantifier of non-Markovianity is the bipartite maximally entangled state. With this result, bypassing the maximization problem, we define a quantifier of non-Markovianity based on the dynamics of the generalized robustness of entanglement, a measure that can be written by means of the entanglement witness approach [10], which allows its evaluation in an efficient manner through robust semidefinite programming (RSDP) [11]. Furthermore, we demonstrate how non-Markovianity can be witnessed directly in the laboratory without the necessity of tomography of the whole state in each instant of time. These results open huge prospects, allowing the study of non-Markovian dynamics for high-dimensional systems as theoretical and experimental points of view.

Maximization of the initial condition - Given a quantum process described by the quantum channel $\Phi_t \in \mathcal{C}(\mathbb{C}_S)$, where $\mathcal{C}(\mathbb{C}_S)$ is the set of complete positive and trace preserving (CPTP) channels on the Hilbert space $\mathbb{C}_S$, the action of the channel over the density matrix of the system $\rho_S \in \mathcal{D}(\mathbb{C}_S)$, where $\mathcal{D}(\mathbb{C}_S)$ is the set of positive semi-definite operators on $\mathbb{C}_S$, results in the time evolution of the system given by:

$$\Phi_t(\rho_S) = \sum_i K_i(t)\rho_s K_i^\dagger(t) = \rho(t), \tag{1}$$

where $\{K_i\}_i$ are the Kraus operators and $\sum_i K_i^\dagger K_i = \mathbb{I}_S$. A sufficient criterion to measure the non-Markovianity of the process Φ_t can be quantified by the positive variation of the entanglement between the system and a purification ancillary system [4]:

$$\mathcal{N}(\Phi_t) = \max_{|\chi\rangle \in \mathbb{C}_{SA}} \int_{\frac{dE}{dt}>0} \frac{dE(\rho(t))}{dt} dt, \tag{2}$$

where E is an entanglement measure, and the optimization is taken over all pure states on $\mathbb{C}_{SA} = \mathbb{C}_S \otimes \mathbb{C}_A$, where the index S indicates the system and A the ancilla. It is important to note that the original measure proposed by Rivas, Huelga and Plenio [4] assumes that the initial state is maximally entangled. Nonetheless, taking this result without a formal proof could, in fact, induce to unexpected (and even wrong) conclusions in studying non-Markovian process. For example, see ref [9, 12]

About the maximization of $\mathcal{N}(\Phi_t)$, it is possible to demonstrate that the optimization of Eq.(2) is attained

by the maximally entangled state $|\phi_+\rangle \in \mathbb{C}_S \otimes \mathbb{C}_A$,

$$\mathcal{N}(\Phi_t) = \int_{\frac{dE}{dt}>0} \frac{dE(\Phi_t \otimes \mathbb{I}[|\phi_+\rangle])}{dt} dt, \tag{3}$$

where $|\phi_+\rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{d}} \sum_j |j\rangle_S |j\rangle_A$, for $d = dim(S) = dim(A)$ and $\{|j\rangle_X\}_{j=1}^d$ is an orthonormal basis on $\mathbb{C}_X$. The demonstration of this result is based on the majorization and state conversion [13]. Then, first, we should present some relevant results about these topics.

1. *Nielsen* [14] shows that a given pure bipartite state $|\chi\rangle_{AB}$ can be converted in to another pure bipartite state $|\phi\rangle_{AB}$ by means of LOCC,

   $$|\chi\rangle_{AB} \xrightarrow{LOCC} |\phi\rangle_{AB},$$

   if and only if $\rho_A^\chi \preceq \rho_A^\phi$, where $\rho_A^X = \mathrm{Tr}_B(|X\rangle\langle X|_{AB})$, which implies that the entanglement of the states satisfy $E(|\chi\rangle_{AB}) \geq E(|\phi\rangle_{AB})$.

2. *Lo and Popescu* [15] show that the LOCC, implemented in the entanglement manipulation of a pure bipartite state, can be described by a single measurement on B, represented by the POVM element Λ_B, and a unitary transformation U_A on A. In this way a bipartite pure state $|\chi\rangle_{AB}$ can be converted into another $|\phi\rangle_{AB}$ by means of:

   $$|\phi\rangle_{AB} = U_A \otimes \Lambda_B |\chi\rangle_{AB}.$$

3. *Konrad et al.* [16] show that

   $$\rho' = \Phi \otimes \mathbb{I}(|\chi\rangle_{AB}) = \Phi \otimes \Lambda_\chi(|\phi_+\rangle_{AB}), \tag{4}$$

   for a given channel $\Phi \in \mathcal{C}(\mathbb{C}_A)$ and Λ_χ is a POVM element on $\mathbb{C}_B$.

Based on the assumptions of 1, 2, and 3, follow the demonstration of Eq. (3).

Proof. Consider an initial bipartite state $|\chi\rangle_{SA} \in \mathbb{C}_S \otimes \mathbb{C}_A$; its evolution is described by the CPTP map $\Phi_S(t)$ over the system S:

$$\rho(t) = \Phi_S(t) \otimes \mathbb{I}_A(|\chi\rangle_{SA}). \tag{5}$$

From Item.2, a POVM element Λ_A exists such that the state $|\chi\rangle_{SA}$ can be created from another state $|\phi\rangle_{SA}$:

$$|\chi\rangle_{SA} = U_S \otimes \Lambda_A |\phi\rangle.$$

From the majorization in Item.1, we obtain that the state $|\phi\rangle_{SA}$ can be the maximally entangled state $|\phi_+\rangle_{SA}$, once that for every pure state $|\chi\rangle_{SA}$:

$$\rho_A^{\phi_+} \preceq \rho_A^\chi.$$

From Item.3, we obtain that:

$$\begin{aligned} \rho(t) &= \Phi_S(t) \otimes \mathbb{I}_A(|\chi\rangle_{SA}) && (6)\\ &= \Phi_S(t) \otimes \Lambda_A(|\phi_+\rangle_{SA}) && (7)\\ &= \mathbb{I}_S \otimes \Lambda_A[\Phi_S(t) \otimes \mathbb{I}_A(|\phi_+\rangle_{SA})], && (8) \end{aligned}$$

where in Eq.(7) we omit the unitary transformation once that quantum entanglement is invariant under local unitary transformations; and in Eq.(8), we use the commutativity between operators acting on different subsystems. Because Λ_A is a local CPTP channel, for an entanglement monotone $E_{S:A}$, it obeys

$$\begin{aligned} E_{S:A}(\rho(t)) &= E_{S:A}(\Phi_S(t) \otimes \mathbb{I}_A(|\chi\rangle_{SA}))\\ &= E_{S:A}(\mathbb{I}_S \otimes \Lambda_A[\Phi_S(t) \otimes \mathbb{I}_A(|\phi_+\rangle_{SA})])\\ &\leq E_{S:A}(\Phi_S(t) \otimes \mathbb{I}_A(|\phi_+\rangle_{SA})). \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, in the intervals of time which the non-Markovianity of the process $\Phi_S(t)$ creates entanglement, the action of the local operation Λ_A (that acts on $\rho(t)$) will decrease the amount of entanglement, which implies that:

$$\int_{t_1}^{t_2} \frac{dE(\Phi_t \otimes \mathbb{I}[|\chi\rangle])}{dt} dt \leq \int_{t_1}^{t_2} \frac{dE(\Phi_t \otimes \mathbb{I}[|\phi_+\rangle])}{dt} dt, \tag{9}$$

where the time interval $[t_1, t_2]$ is one in which the entanglement increases monotonically. Given this inequality and the maximization present in Eq. (2), it finalizes our proof because the action of local interactions $\mathbb{I}_S \otimes \Lambda_A$ over the state $\rho(t) = \Phi_S(t) \otimes \mathbb{I}_A(|\phi_+\rangle_{SA})$ will decrease the entanglement in each instant of time, even in the Markovian intervals. □

It is important to emphasize that a particular case of Eq.(3) was obtained recently by Cervati Neto *et al.* [9]. There the authors show that for the dissipative dynamics of one qubit, the optimal state (between the qubit and the ancilla) that maximizes the entanglement-based measure of non-Markovianity is given by the two-qubit maximally entangled state. Also, it is essential to note that the maximally entangled state does not maximize other non-Markovianity measure based on different correlations as mutual information [17], for example, once our result is obtained based on majorization and state conversion, that has exclusive meaning in entanglement theory. In other words, Eq.(9) is only valid for entanglement monotone quantifiers.

Witnessed Entanglement Approach - In the study of non-Markovianity process by means of quantum entanglement, the dimension of the composed system, i.e., physical system plus an ancillary system, is defined by the square of the dimension of the former. In this sense, it makes necessary a quantifier of entanglement that can be evaluated even for large dimensional bipartite systems. For this purpose, we use the *entanglement witness* approach, which holds for any composed systems [18]. Entanglement witnesses are observables that characterize

the entanglement of the system [19]. It is defined as a Hermitian operator W acting on $\mathbb{C}_A \otimes \mathbb{C}_B$ such that for an entangled state $\rho \in \mathcal{D}(\mathbb{C}_A \otimes \mathbb{C}_B)$, it holds that:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathrm{Tr}(W\rho) &< 0 \qquad (10)\\ \mathrm{Tr}(W\sigma) &\geq 0 \quad \forall \quad \sigma \in Sep. \qquad (11)\end{aligned}$$

where Sep is the set of separable states in $\mathcal{D}(\mathbb{C}_A \otimes \mathbb{C}_B)$.

One important point about the entanglement witness regards its optimization. A given entanglement witness is named *optimal* if it is tangent to the set of separable states [20] and provides a notion about the distance between the state and the border of the separable set. This notion can be approached to quantify the entanglement of the system. Then it is possible to define a class of entanglement quantifiers named *witnessed entanglement* [10, 21], which defines a necessary and sufficient conditions of separability [22]. A witnessed entanglement quantifier can be written as:

$$E_w(\rho) = \max\left\{0, -\min_{W\in\mathcal{W}} \mathrm{Tr}(W\rho)\right\}, \qquad (12)$$

where $\mathcal{W}$ is the set of entanglement witnesses that distinguishes one measure from another, which means that each set $\mathcal{W}$ results in a different entanglement quantifier. This result is particularly interesting since several entanglement quantifiers can be written in the witnessed entanglement form, once that it defines a class of entanglement monotone quantifiers [10, 21]. In a sense, it generalizes the usual entanglement-based measure of quantum non-Markovianity.

An entanglement monotone quantifier that can be written in the witnessed entanglement form is the Generalized Robustness of entanglement, that, for a bipartite state $\rho \in \mathcal{D}(\mathbb{C}_A \otimes \mathbb{C}_B)$, is defined as [23]:

$$R_G(\rho) = \min_{\sigma, s\in\Re_+}\left\{s : \frac{\rho + s\sigma}{s+1} \in Sep\right\}, \qquad (13)$$

where σ is a state that, mixed with ρ, results in a separable state. Restrictions on the state σ in generalized robustness result in different entanglement measures. For example, for $\sigma \in Sep$, it is named *Robustness of Entanglement*, and for σ equal to the maximal mixture state, it is named *Random Robustness* [24]. Unlike generalized robustness and robustness of entanglement, random robustness is not an entanglement monotone [25].

Generalized robustness of entanglement can be written as a witnessed entanglement measure [10, 21] restricting the set of witness operators by $\mathcal{W} = \{W \in \mathcal{W} | W \leq \mathbb{I}\}$. Therefore:

$$R_G(\rho) = \max\left\{0, -\min_{W\leq\mathbb{I}} \mathrm{Tr}(W\rho)\right\}. \qquad (14)$$

The optimization problem of finding an optimal entanglement witness can be approached as a robust semidefinite program [22, 26], which implies that the optimization problems in Eq.(13) and Eq.(14) attach the same solution, giving equivalent formulation for the same optimization problem [27].

Quantification of non-Markovianity - By means of the Generalized Robustness of entanglement, we finally define our evaluable measure of non-Markovianity.

Definition (Non-Markovianity)**.** *Given the generalized robustness of entanglement R_G, we can define a quantifier of non-Markovianity of a process $\Phi_t \in \mathcal{C}(\mathbb{C}_s)$ as*

$$\mathcal{N}_{R_G}(\Phi_t) = \int_{\frac{dR_G}{dt}>0} \frac{dR_G(\Phi_t \otimes \mathbb{I}[|\phi_+\rangle])}{dt} dt, \qquad (15)$$

where the integration is taken over all points such that the variation of the entanglement is positive. These intervals of time indicate the non-Markovianity of the process.

The great advantage of our measure is that both crucial properties of generalized robustness are extended to the quantifier of non-Markovianity in Eq.(15): first, it can be calculated by RSDP for any dimension [22] and, second, it can be written in the entanglement witness form that permits a direct characterization of the non-Markovianity in the laboratory. We can realize the later statement by rewriting the non-Markovianity measure as:

$$\mathcal{N}_{R_G}(\Phi_t) = \int_{\delta R_G>0} \delta R_G(\Phi_t \otimes \mathbb{I}[|\phi_+\rangle]) = \sum_i \Delta R_G(i), \qquad (16)$$

where $\Delta R_G(i) = R_G(t_{i_2}) - R_G(t_{i_1}) > 0$, for $t_{i_2} > t_{i_1}\ \forall\, i \in \mathbb{N}_1$. For a given entangled state $\rho(t)$, the generalized robustness in witnessed entanglement form is given by:

$$R_G(t) = -\mathrm{Tr}[W_t \rho(t)], \qquad (17)$$

where W_t is the optimal entanglement witness for $\rho(t) = \Phi_t \otimes \mathbb{I}(|\phi_+\rangle)$. For two intervals of time $t_2 > t_1$, the variation of the entanglement holds

$$\begin{aligned} \Delta R_G &= R_G(t_2) - R_G(t_1)\\ &= -\left\{\mathrm{Tr}[W_{t_2}\rho(t_2)] - \mathrm{Tr}[W_{t_1}\rho(t_1)]\right\}\\ &= -\left\{\mathrm{Tr}[W_{t_2}(\Phi_{t_2}\otimes\mathbb{I})(|\phi_+\rangle)] - \mathrm{Tr}[W_{t_1}(\Phi_{t_1}\otimes\mathbb{I})(|\phi_+\rangle)]\right\}\\ &= -\left\{\mathrm{Tr}([(\Phi^\dagger_{t_2}\otimes\mathbb{I})(W_{t_2}) - (\Phi^\dagger_{t_1}\otimes\mathbb{I})(W_{t_1})]\phi_+)\right\}\\ &= -\mathrm{Tr}(W(t_2,t_1)\phi_+) \qquad (18)\end{aligned}$$

where $\phi_+ = |\phi_+\rangle\langle\phi_+|$, and $W(t_2,t_1) = [(\Phi^\dagger_{t_2}\otimes\mathbb{I})(W_{t_2}) - (\Phi^\dagger_{t_1}\otimes\mathbb{I})(W_{t_1})]$ is Hermitian, once $W = W^\dagger$. Therefore, the variation of the entanglement in each non-Markovian interval (t_1, t_2) can be obtained in the laboratory, measuring the expectation value of the observable $W(t_2,t_1)$ in the maximally entangled state. It is important to emphasize that Eq. (18) requires knowledge of the dissipative process, and its characterization usually demand a quantum process tomography. However, if the observable $W(t_2,t_1)$ is known theoretically, it is possible to directly measure the non-Markovianity in the laboratory and thus



FIG. 1: (Color Online) An illustrative scheme of the BEC. The physical system is described by two trapped cold atoms (impurities). Each atom describes a two-level system trapped in a double well potential, separated by a distance D, with an optical superlattice of wavelength $\lambda = 4L$.



FIG. 2: (Color Online) (a) Non-Markovianity $\mathcal{N}_{R_G}$ of BEC dynamics in function of scattering length a_E/a_{RB}, for the distance $D = 4L$ (common environment). (b) Non-Markovianity $\mathcal{N}_{R_G}$ of BEC dynamics as a function of the distance D/L for scattering lengths $a_E = 0, 2a_{Rb}$ (blue line); $a_E = 0, 5a_{Rb}$ (green line); and $a_E = 1, 0a_{Rb}$ (red line). For each point, the dynamics for 100 different instants of time have been calculated, computing the non-Markovianity in Eq.(15). The generalized robustness for each instant of time has been calculated by RSDP.

to verify theoretical previsions. Eq. (18) creates a new fashion of the characterization and quantification of non-Markovianity as theoretically as experimentally.

Example - Impurity Atoms Coupled to a Bose-Einstein Condensate - As an example, we study the decoherent dynamics of two trapped cold atoms (impurities), which interact with an ultracold bosonic rubidium gas in a Bose-Einstein condensate (BEC). Each atom is trapped in a double well potential describing, individually, a two-level system in which each base state is associated with the right or left well (See Supplemental Material at [28] for model details). This arrangement has two important characteristics, which can be engineered in the laboratory: the BEC scattering length a_E, which is intimately connected with the boson-boson coupling constant to the BEC environment, and the distance D between the impurities. The former modifies the spectral density as a whole and, consequently, it ohmicity. The latter, on the other hand, infers a change similar to that imposed by the spectral density cutoff frequency [29, 30].

It is important to emphasize that to solve this problem exactly, using either the Breuer, Laine, and Pillo measure (based on trace distance) or the Luo, Fu, and Song measure (based on mutual information dynamics) is a very difficult task, given the optimization problem involved. Also, even for entanglement based-measures, it is a difficult task since the state of the system plus ancilla is given by a 16×16 density matrix. Our measure, on the other hand, overcomes this difficulty, given the power of the RSDP. In Fig.(2.a), we plot non-Markovianity $\mathcal{N}_{R_G}$ of the BEC dynamics as a function of the scattering length a_E for a separation $D = 4L$ (common environment). We obtain a crossover between Markovian and non-Markovian processes for $a_E \approx 0.045 a_{Rb}$, similar to the result presented in Ref. [29, 30].

In Fig.(2.b), on the other hand, we plot non-Markovianity $\mathcal{N}_{R_G}$ of the BEC dynamics as a function of the boson-boson distance D. As we can see, the degree of non-Markovianity does not change with the variation in the boson-boson distance, which diverges from the predictions based on other non-Markovianity measures. Indeed, using the BLP measure, C. Addis et al. show that small distances have a strong effect on the presence of information backflow, tending to a constant value for larger distances [30]. Note, however, that our result is not pointless, once that for decoherent systems, subjected to dephasing errors (as is our example), the map divisibility does not depend on the cutoff frequency, which is intimately connected with the boson-boson distance, which depends on the spectral density shape.

Conclusion - We have presented an analytical solution to the maximization problem involved in the calculation of the entanglement based measure of quantum non-Markovianity. For an arbitrary quantum process, we have demonstrated that the optimal initial bipartite state of the open system and the ancilla is given by a bipartite maximal entangled state. Based on this finding, we introduce a computable measure of quantum non-Markovianity based on the generalized robustness of entanglement. We have shown how a non-Markovian process can be detected by means of an expectation value of an observable, making it attractive for experimental investigations. As an example, we calculate exactly the degree of non-Markovianity of two trapped cold atoms interacting with an ultracold bosonic rubidium gas in a Bose-Einstein condensate (BEC). This finding opens up new avenues in the investigation of quantum non-Markovian dynamics, providing an efficient way to study dissipative processes on high dimensional systems.

Acknowledgments - This work has been supported by the Brazilian agencies FAPESP under the grant number 2015/05581-7, by CNPq under the grant number 474592/2013-8, and by INCT-IQ under the process number 2008/57856-6. The authors also thank S. Maniscalco, R. Vianna and G. Karpat for fruitful discussions.

* Electronic address: debarba@utfpr.edu.br
† Electronic address: fanchini@fc.unesp.br

[1] H.-P. Breuer, E.-M. Laine, J. Piilo, and B. Vacchini, Rev. Mod. Phys. **88**, 021002 (2016), URL http://link.aps.org/doi/10.1103/RevModPhys.88.021002.

[2] M. Nielsen and I. Chuang, *Quantum Computation and Quantum Information*, Cambridge Series on Information and the Natural Sciences (Cambridge University Press, 2000), ISBN 9780521635035, URL http://books.google.com.br/books?id=65FqEKQOfP8C.

[3] H.-P. Breuer, E.-M. Laine, and J. Piilo, Physical review letters **103**, 210401 (2009).

[4] Á. Rivas, S. F. Huelga, and M. B. Plenio, Phys. Rev. Lett. **105**, 050403 (2010), URL http://link.aps.org/doi/10.1103/PhysRevLett.105.050403.

[5] S. Luo, S. Fu, and H. Song, Physical Review A **86**, 044101 (2012).

[6] A. Rivas, S. F. Huelga, and M. B. Plenio, Physical Review Letters **105**, 05403 (2010).

[7] E.-M. Laine, J. Piilo, and H.-P. Breuer, Physical Review A **81**, 062115 (2010).

[8] C. Addis, B. Bylicka, D. Chruściński, and S. Maniscalco, Physical Review A **90**, 052103 (2014).

[9] A. C. Neto, G. Karpat, and F. F. Fanchini, Physical Review A **94**, 032105 (2016).

[10] F. G. S. L. Brandão, Phys. Rev. A **72**, 022310 (2005), URL http://link.aps.org/doi/10.1103/PhysRevA.72.022310.

[11] F. G. S. L. Brandao and R. O. Vianna, Phys. Rev. A **70**, 062309 (2004), quant-ph/0405008v2, URL http://arxiv.org/abs/quant-ph/0405008v2.

[12] F. F. Fanchini, G. Karpat, L. K. Castelano, and D. Z. Rossatto, Physical Review A **88**, 012105 (2013).

[13] M. A. Nielsen and G. Vidal, Quantum Information & Computation **1**, 76 (2001).

[14] M. A. Nielsen, Phys. Rev. Lett. **83**, 436 (1999), URL http://link.aps.org/doi/10.1103/PhysRevLett.83.436.

[15] H.-K. Lo and S. Popescu, Physical Review A **63**, 022301 (2001).

[16] Konrad Thomas, de Melo Fernando, Tiersch Markus, Kasztelan Christian, Aragao Adriano, and Buchleitner Andreas, Nat Phys **4**, 99 (2008), ISSN 1745-2473, 10.1038/nphys885.

[17] F. F. Fanchini, G. Karpat, L. K. Castelano, and D. Z. Rossatto, Physical Review A **88**, 012105 (2013).

[18] M. Horodecki, P. Horodecki, and R. Horodecki, Physics Letters A **223**, 1 (1996).

[19] B. M. Terhal, Physics Letters A Vol. 271, 319 (2000) (2000), quant-ph/9911057v4, URL http://arxiv.org/abs/quant-ph/9911057v4;http://arxiv.org/pdf/quant-ph/9911057v4.

[20] M. Lewenstein, B. Kraus, J. I. Cirac, and P. Horodecki, Phys. Rev. A **62**, 052310 (2000), URL http://link.aps.org/doi/10.1103/PhysRevA.62.052310.

[21] F. G. Brandão and R. O. Vianna, Int. J. of Quant. Inf. **4**, 331 (2006), URL http://www.worldscinet.com/ijqi/04/0402/S0219749906001803.html.

[22] F. G. S. L. Brandão and R. O. Vianna, Phys. Rev. Lett. **93**, 220503 (2004), URL http://link.aps.org/doi/10.1103/PhysRevLett.93.220503.

[23] M. Steiner, Physical Review A **67**, 054305 (2003).

[24] G. Vidal and R. Tarrach, Physical Review A **59**, 141 (1999).

[25] A. W. Harrow and M. A. Nielsen, Physical Review A **68**, 012308 (2003).

[26] F. G. S. L. Brandão and R. O. Vianna, Phys. Rev. A **70**, 062309 (2004), URL http://link.aps.org/doi/10.1103/PhysRevA.70.062309.

[27] S. Boyd and L. Vandenberghe, *Convex Optimization*, Berichte über verteilte messysteme (Cambridge University Press, 2004), ISBN 9780521833783, URL http://books.google.com.br/books?id=mYm0bLd3fcoC.

[28] Supplemental Material at [URL will be inserted by publisher].

[29] P. Haikka, S. McEndoo, G. De Chiara, G. M. Palma, and S. Maniscalco, Phys. Rev. A **84**, 031602 (2011), URL http://link.aps.org/doi/10.1103/PhysRevA.84.031602.

[30] C. Addis, P. Haikka, S. McEndoo, C. Macchiavello, and S. Maniscalco, Phys. Rev. A **87**, 052109 (2013), URL http://link.aps.org/doi/10.1103/PhysRevA.87.052109.

[31] M. A. Cirone, G. D. Chiara, G. M. Palma, and A. Recati, New Journal of Physics **11**, 103055 (2009), URL http://stacks.iop.org/1367-2630/11/i=10/a=103055.

MASTER EQUATION - IMPURITY ATOMS COUPLED TO A BOSE-EINSTEIN CONDENSATE

The dynamics of the two impurities coupled to an ultracold bosonic rubidium gas in a BEC is given by a Lindblad-type master equation with time-dependent decay rates [30, 31]

$$\begin{aligned}\frac{d\rho}{dt} &= \frac{\gamma_1(t)-\gamma_2(t)}{2}\left[\left(\sigma_z^{(1)}-\sigma_z^{(2)}\right)\rho\left(\sigma_z^{(1)}-\sigma_z^{(2)}\right)-\frac{1}{2}\left\{\left(\sigma_z^{(1)}-\sigma_z^{(2)}\right)\left(\sigma_z^{(1)}-\sigma_z^{(2)}\right),\rho\right\}\right] \\ &+\frac{\gamma_1(t)+\gamma_2(t)}{2}\left[\left(\sigma_z^{(1)}+\sigma_z^{(2)}\right)\rho\left(\sigma_z^{(1)}+\sigma_z^{(2)}\right)-\frac{1}{2}\left\{\left(\sigma_z^{(1)}+\sigma_z^{(2)}\right)\left(\sigma_z^{(1)}+\sigma_z^{(2)}\right),\rho\right\}\right], \qquad (19)\end{aligned}$$

where $\sigma_z^{(n)}$ is the usual Pauli matrix for the n-th atom $(n=1,2)$, and

$$\gamma_1(t) = \frac{g_{SE}^2 n_0}{\hbar\pi^2}\int_0^\infty dk k^2 e^{-k^2\sigma^2/2}\frac{\sin\left(\frac{E_k}{2\hbar}t\right)\cos\left(\frac{E_k}{2\hbar}t\right)}{(\epsilon_k+2g_E n_0)}\left(1-\frac{\sin(2kL)}{2kL}\right) \qquad (20)$$

$$\gamma_2(t) = \frac{g_{SE}^2 n_0}{2\hbar\pi^2}\int_0^\infty dk k^2 e^{-k^2\sigma^2/2}\frac{\sin\left(\frac{E_k}{2\hbar}t\right)\cos\left(\frac{E_k}{2\hbar}t\right)}{(\epsilon_k+2g_E n_0)}\left(\frac{\sin(2k(D+L))}{2k(D+L)}+\frac{\sin(2k(D-L))}{2k(D-L)}-2\frac{\sin(2kD)}{2kD}\right), \qquad (21)$$

where the boson-boson coupling of the BEC environment with scattering length a_E and the atomic mass m_E is given by $g_E = 4\pi\hbar^2 a_E/m_E$, and $g_{SE} = 2\pi\hbar^2 a_{SE}/m_{SE}$ is the coupling between the system and the environment with scattering length a_{SE} and reduced mass $m_{SE} = m_S m_E/(m_S+m_E)$. Also, the energy of the k-th Bogoliubov mode is given by $E_k = \sqrt{2\epsilon_k n_0 g_E+\epsilon_k^2}$, where n_0 is the condensate density, $\epsilon_k = \hbar^2k^2/2m_E$ and σ is the variance parameter of the lattice site. Here we consider ^{23}Na impurity atoms immersed in a ^{87}Rb condensate with $\lambda = 600$ nm and $n_0 = 10^{20}$ m^{-3}. The scattering length of the atoms is $a_{Rb} = 99a_0$ with the Bohr radius given by a_0, and $a_{SE} = 55a_0$. Finally, the two engineered variables are the distance between the atoms which is given by $2D \geq 8L$, for $L = \lambda/4$, and the scattering length of the BEC environment which is given by a_E.